

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-18 will be pending.

Applicants propose to amend Figure 5 of the drawings as indicated in the accompanying Request for Approval of Drawing Changes. Figure 5 of the drawings has been amended to replace reference designation 81 for 'PCI bus' with reference designation 801.

Objections to the Drawings

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the drawings for failing to show personal timer setting screen 140 in Figure 14 as described in the specification. The specification has been amended to replace reference designation 140 for designating a personal timer setting screen with reference designation 150. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the following informalities: Reference designation 81 is used to make reference to both the RAM and the PCI bus. Figure 5 of the drawings has been amended to replace reference designation 81 for 'PCI bus' with reference designation 801. As noted above, applicant has submitted a Request for Approval of Drawing Changes accompanying this amendment, including marked photocopy of a proposed drawing change addressing this objection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner approve the drawing change and withdraw this objection.

§103 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,392,669; hereinafter referred to as “Matoba”) and Pietropaolo *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,351,765; hereinafter referred to as “Pietropaolo”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 are directed to a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration. For example, in one aspect, a reservation registration apparatus enables reservation registration by displaying a reservation subject icon representing a reservation subject and by using a time base display area. When the reservation subject icon is moved onto the time base display area, a reservation time display division is displayed in a timeline indicating a starting time and an ending time.

Considering the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 in Section 4 of the Office Action, it does not appear that the arguments presented by the Examiner in rejecting the claims show that there was any motivation to combine the prior art references of Matoba and Pietropaolo. Specifically, it appears that the arguments presented by the Examiner indicate that “Matoba teaches a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium (see column 2, line 41). ... Matoba however doesn’t teach a time based display area, wherein when an icon is moved into the display area, the display area displays the corresponding time division.” (Section 4 of the Office Action). It further appears that the arguments presented by the Examiner show that “Pietropaolo teaches a media editing system” (Section 4 of the Office Action).

However, it appears that there is no motivation in Matoba to combine the schedule management system of Matoba with the media editing system of Pietropaolo. Furthermore, it

appears that there is no motivation in Pietropaolo to combine the media editing system with the schedule management system of Matoba. On the contrary, Pietropaolo seems to teach away from the main purpose of Matoba's schedule management system of providing global file access and sharing without time limitation. The main purpose of Pietropaolo's media editing system is to allow retrieval of video segments "at a higher quality, only those video segments that are actually used in the final program ... Moreover, the video segments can be retrieved at off-peak times, so as not to overburden the network during peak hours (e.g., 8 am – 6 pm)." (Pietropaolo, column 5, lines 2-6).

Without further explanation by the Examiner, it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Matoba and Pietropaolo teaches or suggests a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration embodied in independent claims 1, 7, and 13. Claims 2-3, 8-9, and 14-15 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively, and it is also submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Matoba and Pietropaolo shows or suggests claims 2-3, 8-9, and 14-15, through their dependence on claims 1, 7, and 13, as described above.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Matoba and Pietropaolo, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 7-9, and 13-15 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Prothereo *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,414,686; hereinafter referred to as “Prothereo”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claims 4-5, 10-11, and 16-17 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. As discussed above, claims 1, 7, and 13 are directed to a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration. However, as discussed above, the Examiner indicated that Matoba teaches a schedule management system and that Pietropaolo teaches a media editing system. The Examiner also indicated that Matoba does not teach a time based display area, wherein when an icon is moved into the display area, the display area displays the corresponding time division. Furthermore, the Examiner indicated in Section 7 of the Office Action that Prothereo teaches a multimedia editing system.

It was discussed above that there is no motivation either in Matoba or in Pietropaolo to combine these references. Further, there is no motivation either in Matoba (which teaches a schedule management system) or in Prothereo (which teaches a multimedia editing system) to combine these references. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Prothereo teaches or suggests a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration embodied in claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Prothereo, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's

rejection of claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claims 6, 12, and 18

In Section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow *et al.* (U.S. Patent 6,538,665; hereinafter referred to as “Crow”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claims 6, 12, and 18 depend from claims 1, 7, and 13, respectively. As discussed above, claims 1, 7, and 13 are directed to a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration. However, as discussed above, the Examiner indicated that Matoba teaches a schedule management system and that Pietropaolo teaches a media editing system. The Examiner also indicated that Matoba does not teach a time based display area, wherein when an icon is moved into the display area, the display area displays the corresponding time division. Furthermore, the Examiner indicated in Section 8 of the Office Action that Crow teaches a media presentation scheme.

It was discussed above that there is no motivation either in Matoba or in Pietropaolo to combine these references. Further, there is no motivation either in Matoba (which teaches a schedule management system) or in Crow (which teaches a media presentation scheme) to combine these references. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how the cited combination of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow teaches or suggests a reservation registration apparatus, method, and storage medium that enables relatively easy reservation registration embodied in claims 6, 12, and 18.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 6, 12, and 18 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Matoba, Pietropaolo, and Crow, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 6, 12, and 18 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1-18 are respectfully solicited.


In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By:



William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800

PATENT
Appl. No. 09/769,968
Attorney Docket No. 450100-02952

APPENDIX